

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/963,920 | BARANY ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Padmashri Ponnaluri | 1639 | |

All Participants:

(1) Padmashri Ponnaluri.

(2) Applicant's attorney Michael Goldman.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 10 June 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

claim 120

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner has called to discuss the amendment to claim 120, (being designed to bind to complementary nucleic acids), which is vague. Applicants attorney has authorized to amend the claim to replace 'being designed' with 'able'.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)